

REPORT OF THE
OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR GENERAL
TO THE
JOINT LEGISLATIVE AUDIT COMMITTEE

841

A PROGRAM REVIEW OF
THE CALIFORNIA CONSERVATION CORPS

NOVEMBER 1978



CHAIRMAN
RICHARD ROBINSON
SANTA ANA

ASSEMBLYMEN
DANIEL BOATWRIGHT
CONCORD

EUGENE A. CHAPPIE
ROSEVILLE

MIKE CULLEN
LONG BEACH

Joint Legislative Audit Committee

OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR GENERAL

California Legislature

RICHARD ROBINSON
CHAIRMAN



VICE CHAIRMAN
ALBERT RODDA
SACRAMENTO

SENATORS
PAUL CARPENTER
CYPRESS

GEORGE DEUKMEJIAN
LONG BEACH

NATE HOLDEN
LOS ANGELES

November 27, 1978

The Honorable Speaker of the Assembly
The Honorable President pro Tempore of the Senate
The Honorable Members of the Senate and the
Assembly of the Legislature of California

Members of the Legislature:

Your Joint Legislative Audit Committee respectfully submits the Auditor General's report on the California Conservation Corps.

The report identifies conditions that limit CCC's effectiveness in accomplishing conservation work and providing employment and training opportunities to the State's youth. In addition, this review indicates that CCC's goals for 1978-79 are unrealistic in view of the high corpsmember attrition rate.

The Auditor General recommends specific action which the California Conservation Corps and the Legislature should consider in correcting the problems described in this report.

The auditors are Harold L. Turner, Audit Manager; William M. Zimmerling, CPA, Supervising Auditor; Richard C. Tracy; Ann Arneill, Melanie M. Kee; and Edwin H. Shepherd.

Respectfully submitted,



RICHARD ROBINSON
Chairman

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
SUMMARY	1
INTRODUCTION	3
AUDIT RESULTS	6
Opportunities Exist to Improve Selection of Conservation Work Projects	6
Recommendation	12
Corpsmember Hiring Practices Limit CCC's Impact on Youth Unemployment	13
Recommendation	17
Emphasis on Appropriate Technology Program May Be Excessive	18
Recommendation	21
Current CCC Goals Are Unrealistic in Light of High Attrition	23
Recommendation	26
OTHER PERTINENT INFORMATION	27
Need for Improved Management Information	27
WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT	31
Director, California Conservation Corps	31
APPENDICES	
Appendix A-- California Conservation Corps Centers	A-1
Appendix B-- Flowchart of Project Review Procedures	B-1
Appendix C-- Public Service Conservation Work Projects	C-1
Appendix D-- Appropriate Technology Curriculum	D-1
Appendix E-- Goals of the California Conservation Corps--1978-79	E-1

SUMMARY

The California Conservation Corps (CCC) was established in 1976 to accomplish conservation work and to provide employment and training opportunities to the State's young men and women. The enabling legislation was given urgency status to allow the CCC to alleviate the State's unemployment problem.

Although the CCC has completed many worthwhile conservation projects, we found that:

- Weaknesses in CCC's procedures for identifying and selecting public service conservation work (PSCW) allow projects to be completed that exhibit limited environmental benefit, little public use opportunities and/or questionable on-the-job training value (page 6)
- Although CCC's hiring practices comply with state law, they are not directed toward reducing unemployment, a stated goal of the program. We found that only nine percent of the corpsmembers were unemployed prior to enlistment with the CCC (page 13)
- Over 40 percent of corpsmember time is devoted to Appropriate Technology (AT) activities, thereby limiting the accomplishment of PSCW projects. If CCC reduced AT activities by one-half, 33 percent more conservation work could be accomplished (page 18)

- Based on CCC's current rate of attrition, CCC will not reach its projected corpsmember population of 1,600 in fiscal year 1978-79. As a result, CCC will neither be employing youth nor protecting the environment to the extent it has planned (page 23).

On pages 12, 17, 21 and 26, we make recommendations for consideration by the CCC and the Legislature which we believe will alleviate the above problems.

INTRODUCTION

In response to a resolution of the Joint Legislative Audit Committee, the Office of the Auditor General reviewed the operations of the California Conservation Corps (CCC). The review was conducted under the authority vested in the Auditor General by Section 10527 of the Government Code.

CCC Goals and Objectives

The California Conservation Corps, established by a 1976 amendment to the Public Resources Code (Section 14000 et seq.), was created to: (1) further the development and maintenance of the natural resources and environment of the State and (2) provide meaningful productive employment, training and education to the State's young men and women. To accomplish this, the Legislature established the following objectives for the CCC:

- Accomplish useful and needed public works projects that will protect, develop and maintain the natural environment
- Maintain fire prevention and fire suppression capability in rural areas
- Provide on-the-job training so that corpsmembers may acquire employable skills, experience and knowledge

- Instill in corpsmembers an appreciation and understanding of the natural environment.

Training and Work Program

California residents age 16 to 23 may apply to the CCC. Applicants must be willing to follow a strict, strenuous schedule of work and education in a residential camp setting for one year. Corpsmembers are paid the minimum wage and are charged for meals and lodging.

Corpsmembers are initially assigned to the Training Academy in Murphys, California for a four-week orientation and training session, and then to one of the 17 base centers* for the remainder of the year. The base center functions as the corpsmember's home, work site and recreational center. From the base center corpsmembers are assigned to urban and rural public service conservation work projects. Examples of completed work projects are: emergency and disaster relief, such as fire and flood control; fish and wildlife habitat enhancement; forest improvement and revegetation; and parks and recreation development.

In addition to project work, corpsmembers must participate in the Appropriate Technology (AT) program. The AT program was developed in fiscal year 1977-78 as an integral component of CCC to teach skills and develop attitudes related to an understanding of the

*CCC base centers are shown in Appendix A.

State's natural resources. The AT curriculum includes training in food preparation, greenhouse horticulture, animal husbandry and auto mechanics; and career planning and employment preparation.

Program Administration

The CCC is headed by a director and a deputy director who occupy statutorily exempt positions. CCC headquarters is located in Sacramento and has 61 authorized staff positions. As of September 1, 1978 the training academy and base centers had permanent staff positions of 302 and a corpsmember population of 1,009. Expenditures and the number of base centers for CCC in fiscal years 1976-77, 1977-78 and 1978-79 are shown below:

	(Actual)	(Estimated)	(Proposed)
	<u>1976-77</u>	<u>1977-78</u>	<u>1978-79</u>
Expenditures	\$7,864,979	\$11,776,232	\$20,084,935
Base Centers	8	16	24

Scope of Review

In evaluating the CCC's effectiveness in accomplishing its mandated goals, we reviewed operations in its headquarters, training academy and selected base centers. We sent questionnaires to corpsmembers and graduates of the program and interviewed corpsmembers and staff to obtain an understanding of the corps' activities. We also analyzed completed work projects, hiring practices and the management information system.

AUDIT RESULTS

OPPORTUNITIES EXIST TO IMPROVE SELECTION OF CONSERVATION WORK PROJECTS

Weaknesses in CCC's project approval procedures permit the selection of some conservation work projects that are inconsistent with legislative requirements. Consequently, while the CCC has accomplished thousands of hours of productive work, some projects have limited environmental benefit, provide little public use opportunity and/or provide questionable training value.

Public Service Conservation Work

Section 14302 of the Public Resources Code requires the CCC to engage in projects which conserve, improve or develop natural resources and enhance, preserve and maintain environmentally important public lands and waters. The law further specifies that these projects shall be undertaken in urban and rural areas and shall be selected on the basis of:

- The environmental and natural resource benefits offered
- The opportunities for public use
- The on-the-job training value.

In addition, fire prevention and suppression, under the administration and direction of the Department of Forestry, is a major emphasis of the rural program.* Legislation also allows the CCC to engage in emergency projects such as natural disasters, floods and search and rescue operations.

In response to these mandates, CCC placed primary program emphasis on the accomplishment of public service conservation work (PSCW). Public service conservation work is generated through work project proposals submitted by sponsors; generally public agencies or private, nonprofit organizations. Project proposals are reviewed, evaluated and approved in accordance with CCC procedures.

Accomplishments

Since July 1976 the CCC has received over 1,863 requests for assistance from project sponsors. CCC reported that over 885,948 corpsmember hours were expended on PSCW between July 1976 through September 1978. Approximately 411 projects were completed and 99 projects were in progress as of September 1978.

Typical conservation projects completed by CCC during 1977-78 include:**

*Seven of the 17 CCC centers are operated cooperatively with the Department of Forestry for the primary purpose--during fire season--of fighting fires. For the balance of the year, fire centers work on projects similar to those of other CCC centers.

**Appendix B provides additional data on PSCW.

- Park and recreation development, such as improving trails, rebuilding campfire circles and rehabilitating facilities in park areas
- Fish and wildlife habitat enhancement, such as clearing streams and improving nesting sites
- Forest improvement and restoration, such as planting over one million trees in state and federal forests
- Conservation rehabilitation and construction, such as restoring historical sites.

In addition, from January 1, 1978 through July 25, 1978, corpsmembers responded to 55 emergencies such as fires, floods, droughts and windstorms.

Weaknesses in Project Approval Procedures

Our review of completed work projects indicates that most projects appear to be aligned with the intent of the legislation establishing the program. However, weaknesses in project selection procedures permit some projects to be completed that exhibit limited environmental benefit, little public use opportunities and/or questionable on-the-job training value. The principal weaknesses in the project selection procedures are:

- Lack of an adequate system to identify the State's conservation needs
- Inadequate project review procedures.*

Lack of a System to
Identify Conservation Needs

CCC has not developed a needs assessment system to ensure selection of conservation projects that are the most beneficial to the State. California's conservation work needs are not assessed nor are potential projects ranked in order of value. CCC's project selection division, therefore, is unable to assure that one project has greater value than another. As a result, some projects are approved and completed that exhibit limited environmental and natural resource benefit. For example:

One project called for the construction of a surge-pit and bathhouse for a small rural community swimming pool. Corpsmembers provided labor and were supervised by pool construction supervisors. While corpsmembers received on-the-job training in construction skills and the community was provided increased recreational opportunities, the environmental and natural resource benefits of this project appear limited. CCC's evaluation of the proposal failed to identify or discuss any aspect of the environmental benefits of the project. Nevertheless, the project rated seven on a scale of ten on the CCC project completion report.

Another project called for the removal of trees surrounding a rural airport runway. Corpsmembers removed trees and shrubs to provide safer access for airplane traffic. This project does not appear to be in consonance with CCC's reforestation mission. Neither the proposal evaluation nor the completion report addressed the environmental considerations of this project.

*Appendix C flowcharts CCC's conservation project review procedures.

A third project entailed moving surplus equipment from one state hospital to another. Corpsmembers loaded hospital furniture and equipment onto moving trailers and unloaded the material at the other hospital. According to the CCC evaluation, the corpsmembers learned packing and basic moving skills plus contributed to the recycling of surplus materials among governmental agencies. However, the evaluation did not discuss how this project contributed to the maintenance of the State's natural resources nor if the project increased public use opportunities on environmentally important public lands and waters.

CCC management has recognized deficiencies in the project approval process and has agreed that an adequate needs assessment system should be developed to channel CCC's efforts toward the most beneficial public service conservation work. Although they directed that an assessment of PSCW be performed, as of September 15, 1978, the assessment was still forthcoming.

Inadequate Project Review Procedures

CCC has not developed sufficient review procedures to ensure that all projects meet each legislative requirement. The major deficiencies are:

- The project proposal form does not inquire about environmental and natural resource benefit
- Standards for evaluation and approval of proposals are broad
- CCC has no evaluation criteria for completed projects.

Because of the above deficiencies, projects receive inadequate and inconsistent review. As a result, some approved and completed projects fail to address each of the three criterion for selection-- environmental benefit, public use opportunities and on-the-job training value. For example:

One project involved landscaping grounds around a metropolitan water district pumping station. The project did address erosion problems and may have provided training in landscaping, but the water district is located on land that is restricted from public use.

One project involved gathering jojoba seeds in state and federal park land. According to the project reports oil from jojoba seeds may (among other things) offer an alternative to the use of whale oil. Researchers believe that whales may be saved by substituting jojoba oil for whale oil. This project provided no opportunities for public use. The on-the-job training value was limited to hand-picking of berries. The project may not directly provide conservation value to the State's natural resources, but may enhance research which could have future value.

One project required two corpsmembers to staff an information booth at a soil district convention. Corpsmembers handed out information, showed slides and answered questions of attending conventioners. While corpsmembers may have benefited from exposure to public relations activities, the general public did not gain increased public use opportunities nor did the project evaluation address the environmental or natural resource benefits of this project.

CCC management told us that improvement is needed in the project selection process. Due to time and staffing limitations, corrective action has not been taken.

CONCLUSION

CCC has claimed completion of over 885,000 hours of PSCW. Although many of these projects are worthwhile, weaknesses in the project approval system allow some projects to be selected that do not meet legislative requirements. CCC has recognized deficiencies in the evaluation processes but has not taken corrective action.

RECOMMENDATION

We recommend that the CCC:

- Develop a system to identify and prioritize conservation work needs. CCC should inventory conservation and natural resource work needs and select projects on the basis of highest value
- Develop specific written procedures to assist staff in adequately evaluating and reviewing project proposals. Procedures should be uniform and complete to ensure selection of projects that meet each objective of legislative selection criteria.
- Develop specific guidelines for evaluation of completed projects so that CCC staff can uniformly assess the relative value of PSCW projects.

CORPSMEMBER HIRING PRACTICES
LIMIT CCC'S IMPACT ON YOUTH
UNEMPLOYMENT

Although CCC's enabling legislation was given urgency status to address, in part, the State's unemployment problem, CCC's hiring practices permit the selection of corpsmember recruits regardless of their employment status. Only nine percent of the corpsmembers we surveyed were unemployed prior to joining the CCC. By not assigning recruitment priority to unemployed applicants, CCC limits its ability to increase employment opportunities for those individuals that could benefit most from the program. Although CCC's selection process complies with state law, it limits CCC's impact on the State's unemployment problem.

CCC Employment Objectives

One of the purposes of CCC is to provide productive public service employment to the young men and women of the State. Section 14001 of the enabling legislation provides that corpsmembers are to be selected on the basis of "motivation for hard work, personal development, and public service and without regard to their prior employment or educational background." The legislation also allows the CCC to draw "upon the special skills of persons of all age groups . . ." While not requiring CCC to hire unemployed youth, the legislation was given urgency status, in part, because the "act will contribute to the reduction of the widespread unemployment in the State."*

*Chapter 342, Statutes of 1976.

The CCC developed A Handbook on Corpsmember's Recruitment and Selection to explain all aspects of recruitment and selection procedures. Recruitment goals are stated as follows:

It is the intention of the CCC to unite California's unemployed youth, through the recruitment process, into a single effort devoted to preserving the State's natural resources with hard work and dedication.

In addition, in a forward to the handbook entitled A Message From the Director, the Director of CCC states:

In today's uncertain world, it is difficult for our young people to find a purpose for their lives. This along with the serious problem of youth unemployment demonstrates the need for a California Conservation Corps.

Recruitment and Selection Procedures
Do Not Favor Unemployed Applicants

According to CCC procedures prospective applicants must meet the following minimum requirements:

- Reside in California
- Be between the ages of 18 and 20*
- Be willing to perform strenuous labor and participate in educational activities in a camp setting for one year.

Employment status, however, is not part of the corpsmember qualification criteria.

*Recent federal grant requirements will permit selection of youth between 16 and 23 years of age.

Officials at CCC told us that employment status is not assessed prior to selection because they have interpreted the law as prohibiting selection on the basis of prior employment or educational background. According to one official, "It is good the program is open to all and fair to all. CCC will practically hire anybody who applies if they meet minimum age and residency criteria."

As of July 1, 1978, CCC turned all corpsmember recruitment, screening and referral duties over to the Employment Development Department (EDD). An EDD official indicated that they target recruitment in areas of high youth unemployment; however, CCC has not required EDD to ascertain the employment status of recruits. EDD took over corpsmember recruitment so recently that we were unable to determine whether their recruitment policies will make any difference in the number of unemployed youth recruited into the program.

Little Impact on Unemployed Youth

Since both the enabling legislation and the CCC's own publications emphasize CCC's role in addressing the youth unemployment problem, we tested the degree to which the CCC has recruited unemployed youth. In August 1978, we administered a questionnaire to approximately 300 corpsmembers (34 percent of the corpsmember population during that month). One question asked, "What were you doing before you joined the California Conservation Corps?" The results follow:

	<u>Number</u>	<u>% of Total</u>
In School	78	27
Working	96	33
Working and In School	89	31
Unemployed	24	9
No Response	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	<u>290</u>	<u>100</u>

As shown, despite the stated emphasis on addressing youth unemployment problems, only nine percent of the corpsmembers were unemployed immediately prior to employment with CCC. Consequently, those youth most in need of employment are not directly benefiting from the program.

CONCLUSION

CCC's enabling legislation alludes to the State's unemployment problem, but permits selection of CCC recruits without regard to their employment status. Thus, the CCC does not assign recruitment and selection priority to unemployed applicants. As a result, the CCC has negligible impact on the State's youth unemployment problem.

RECOMMENDATION

The Legislature may wish to evaluate CCC's role in addressing youth unemployment. If the Legislature desires greater impact from the CCC, it could clarify the intent of the legislation by assigning corpsmember recruitment and selection priority to unemployed applicants.

EMPHASIS ON APPROPRIATE TECHNOLOGY
PROGRAM MAY BE EXCESSIVE

Approximately 40 percent of corpsmember working hours are expended on activities charged to the Appropriate Technology (AT) program. While the program appears to offer some worthwhile educational experiences, the program is not specifically mandated by legislation and impacts adversely on CCC's primary objective--the accomplishment of conservation work.

The AT Program

The Appropriate Technology program is one of the major program areas of the CCC. According to the CCC the AT program is designed to teach skills and develop attitudes which accomplish the following objectives:

- Enable corpsmembers to understand and appreciate the natural resources of the State
- Teach basic employable skills and sound work habits
- Provide an opportunity for the personal growth and development of corpsmembers
- Provide a foundation for a more successful life and an expanded base for making choices about future work and study.

Other subobjectives, according to CCC management, include: renovating and maintaining base centers; maintaining corpsmember interest in CCC; reducing the attrition rate; and enhancing the ability of corpsmembers to perform conservation work.

To accomplish these objectives CCC developed an AT curriculum composed of 16 subject areas totaling 442 hours of required course work.* Corpsmembers earn credit for completion of course work in several ways including center maintenance and renovation activities, AT projects and workshops, and courses at local community colleges. The AT program is a required activity for all corpsmembers and extends beyond the 8-to-5 daytime program. Many workshops, projects and classes are held during the evening hours.

AT projects common to most centers include solar greenhouses, gardens, handbuilt compost bins and animal husbandry projects. Corpsmembers at the centers also have the option of working on projects special to their area. For instance, one center has an operating sawmill while another has a tree nursery operation.

AT Program Emphasis Appears Excessive in Light of Legislative Mandate

The principal objective of the CCC, according to enabling legislation and management officials, is to accomplish public service conservation work. The law also requires CCC to benefit corpsmembers

*See Appendix D for a list of appropriate technology curriculum.

by providing meaningful educational opportunities and on-the-job training. The Appropriate Technology program was developed by CCC to address the educational and training elements of the legislation.

We were told by CCC management that although the AT program is not specifically authorized by the law, statutory authority is implicit within the language. One official told us that AT is "over and above" what is directly authorized by the law but nevertheless contributes to the objectives of CCC because it contributes to the public service work program. Although CCC had not established planned levels of AT program activity, we were told that not more than 25 percent of daytime corpsmember work hours were expended on AT activities. With the concurrence of CCC management we reviewed the level of AT program activity during one representative month. We found that approximately 42 percent of corpsmember daytime work hours were expended on activities charged to the AT program. Our review of another month revealed a similar level of effort.

The following examples demonstrate the extent to which CCC emphasizes the AT program.

During the month of July 1978, corpsmembers at a temporary work site at a state park expended approximately 30 percent of daytime work hours on activities charged to AT. Although the work site is rented from a private party and was not designated as a CCC center, corpsmembers spent almost a third of their time on AT activities such as, building compost bins, renovating living quarters and establishing a garden.

The corpsmembers at the CCC training academy are required to spend 50 percent of their month-long orientation and training schedule on AT programs, despite the fact that the principal objective of the CCC is to accomplish PSCW.

AT Program May Limit Accomplishment of PSCW

Spending over 40 percent of corpsmember work hours on a program without clear statutory authority negatively impacts on the program objectives. Although the AT program may have tangible benefits, such as improving center living conditions, and intangible benefits, such as helping corpsmembers become more self-reliant; it limits the accomplishment of public service conservation work. For example, if CCC had limited AT to 20 percent of the work time CCC could have performed 33 percent* more PSCW in fiscal year 1977-78.

CONCLUSION

CCC spends over 40 percent of daily work time on the AT program. Although the program appears to provide some valuable educational and training benefits, it is not specifically mandated by law and limits the accomplishment of PSCW.

RECOMMENDATION

To ensure that it is adequately addressing the State's conservation needs, the CCC should reassess its emphasis of the AT program. Specific performance goals should be established and the level of program effort should be evaluated for potential deemphasis.

*Time spent on PSCW would increase from 60 percent to 80 percent of corpsmember hours--a 33 percent increase in time expended on PSCW.

The Legislature may wish to evaluate the AT program's contribution to the accomplishment of CCC objectives and then clarify the statutory authority to conduct the program.

CURRENT CCC GOALS ARE
UNREALISTIC IN LIGHT OF
HIGH ATTRITION

CCC reported to the Legislature in March 1978 that an immediate objective was the enrollment of 1,600 corpsmembers during fiscal year 1978-79. The current budget and the authorization to open eight new centers are based on this level of strength. The CCC stated an additional 1978-79 goal of accomplishing two million hours of public service conservation work. Based on CCC's own projections of attrition and corpsmember strength during fiscal year 1978-79, these goals are unrealistic.*

Attrition is Higher Than Reported

The CCC's actual rate of attrition is substantially higher than it has reported. In its March 1, 1978 report to the Legislature, the CCC reported an attrition rate of "about 30 percent depending on how corpsmember strength is related to the passage of time," and indicated it expected the rate to "drop to 20-25 percent." At the time the report was prepared, no CCC class had completed a year enlistment. Consequently, CCC felt it was too early to fully evaluate attrition. Since that time, five classes have completed a full year term. We found that of 397 corpsmembers enrolled in the first five classes, 155 graduated at the end of their year enlistment, for an average attrition rate of 61 percent. We did not determine the reasons for this rate of attrition. Table 1 displays the attrition data on the first five classes.

*CCC goals for fiscal year 1978-79 are shown in Appendix E.

TABLE 1
CORPSMEMBER POPULATION DATA

<u>Corpsmembers</u>				<u>Attrition</u>			
<u>Class</u>	<u>Enrolled</u>	<u>Graduates</u>	<u>Graduation Date</u>	<u>Terminated</u>	<u>Resigned</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>%</u>
1	68	25	2/78	9	34	43	63
2	66	22	4/78	12	32	44	67
3	76	29	6/78	10	37	47	62
4	80	29	8/78	21	30	51	64
5	107	50	9/78	14	43	57	53

In the March 1978 report, CCC also contrasted its expected attrition rate of 20-25 percent to some other similar youth programs. Applying this same comparison but using CCC's actual attrition rate of 61 percent, we found that CCC's rate is higher than the others. For instance, during the first 30 days the Jobs Corps loses 15 percent of its enrollees while CCC loses 33 percent. Table 2 compares CCC's attrition rate to those of other programs.

TABLE 2
CCC's ATTRITION RATE
COMPARED TO OTHER PROGRAMS

<u>Program</u>	<u>Attrition Rate</u>	<u>Length of Program</u>
CCC	61%	1 year
Community Colleges	29%*	2 years
High School	25%*	4 years
Military	40%*	4 years

*These rates were reported in CCC's March 1978 report. We have not independently verified them.

Continued Attrition Will
Limit Accomplishment of Goals

As of September 5, 1978, approximately 1,000 corpsmembers were enrolled. CCC has scheduled ten academy classes to begin during fiscal year 1978-79. It anticipates that 300 corpsmembers will enroll in each class. Based on CCC's own projections of corpsmember enrollment and attrition, CCC will not reach its population objective of 1,600 corpsmembers during the year. Furthermore, CCC will be unable to maintain a corpsmember population over 1,400 through fiscal year 1978-79. Since work project goals are based on having 1,600 corpsmembers, CCC will be unable to accomplish the planned two million hours of public service conservation work.

As mentioned on page 15, EDD began recruiting corpsmembers on July 1, 1978. Our analysis of attrition in the training academy revealed no significant difference in attrition between corpsmembers recruited by EDD and those recruited by CCC.

CONCLUSION

CCC's rate of attrition is higher than it has indicated to the Legislature. CCC reported an attrition rate of "about 30 percent." We found the true attrition rate to be 61 percent.

CCC will not be able to accomplish all of its goals since projections indicate it will not reach a level of 1,600 corpsmembers during fiscal year 1978-79. If that level is not reached, it is unlikely that CCC will complete all the work projects planned.

Further, CCC will not have the capacity to support its currently budgeted program or to fill the eight new centers scheduled to open during the year. Finally, CCC will neither be employing youth nor protecting the environment to the extent it has planned.

RECOMMENDATION

We recommend that the CCC acknowledge its true rate of attrition and accurately address it. The CCC should determine the causes of this high attrition rate and take appropriate action to lower it. If the attrition rate cannot be lowered, CCC should establish realistic goals which can be met with the corpsmember population which can be obtained. The need for eight new centers during fiscal year 1978-79 should also be re-evaluated.

OTHER PERTINENT INFORMATION

NEED FOR IMPROVED MANAGEMENT INFORMATION

CCC's management information system does not adequately meet CCC's need for information. Because data on program performance are often unavailable or unreliable, management is unable to adequately assess CCC's operational efficiency and program effectiveness. Although CCC has recognized this and has taken steps to provide some data, additional effort is needed.

Management Information Requirements

CCC is required by law to report to the Legislature on work accomplishments and program effectiveness. The first such report was made in March 1978. The second is due in December 1979. The enabling legislation includes a clause whereby the CCC will expire in 1981 unless extended by legislation. Reported program performance may heavily influence the decision as to whether the program is extended.

The CCC created the Office of Program Development, Research and Evaluation (OPDRE) to respond to the following needs:

To achieve its [CCC's] program objectives, the Director needs the staff capabilities to evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of the CCC's operations. The Director must have sufficient information to assess the relative merits of the program and its corpsmembers' performance. He must be able to realistically plan for the systematic implementation of departmental policies. More specifically, the Director needs

information about how the program is operating and how it is being managed, how funds are being expended [,] what results are being obtained, how corpsmembers are being served and whether the existing program is addressing their needs. The Director also needs to be presented with alternatives, options, and recommendations for increasing operating efficiency of the specific program, strengthening management and organization, and improving departmental services.*

The office is composed of three sections: Data Collection and Analysis, Grants and Information.

The Data Collection and Analysis Section was given the following responsibilities:

- Evaluate the effectiveness of the program to determine whether the CCC is carrying out legislative intent
- Conduct surveys to identify various managerial problems and program needs
- Conduct studies (including cost-benefit analyses) designed to identify improved procedures and methods. Establish and maintain a work measurement system and provide reports on operational efficiency
- Publish ongoing monthly, quarterly and annual statistical reports on the CCC program and corpsmember activities; including preparing data in tabular form, analyzing the data using appropriate statistical techniques and writing interpretive reports of findings

- Develop and initiate surveys and questionnaires on the general orientation of the CCC program and interpret the findings in terms of: What is the CCC? How does it work? Why does one join the CCC? Why do corpsmembers leave the CCC? Is the CCC developing useful skills? Is staff training adequate? Is the recruitment optimum? Who is involved?

Management Information Is Limited

Our review of OPDRE's performance revealed that little action has been taken to satisfy CCC's management information needs. As shown in previous sections of this report, program data on the employment status of corpsmembers, attrition and appropriate technology were either inaccurate or unavailable. Further, conservation work project accomplishments claimed in CCC's March 1978 report were overstated. In our opinion, management needs program information, such as attrition and AT workload data, to effectively manage its program. In addition, although OPDRE accomplished numerous tasks related to federal grant funding and public information, it failed to produce the information described in its program narrative. For example, as of September 1, 1978 OPDRE had produced none of the following:


- Work measurement systems and reports on operational efficiency
- Cost benefit analyses to improve procedures and methods
- Studies on program effectiveness

- Surveys identifying managerial problems and program needs.

CCC staff told us that efforts are currently in progress to establish a management information system to collect and produce data on corpsmember activities. In addition, planning is under way to initiate cost-benefit and efficiency studies. We were also told that progress in the Data Collection and Analysis section has been slow because of lack of staffing and higher priorities in other areas.

As a result of CCC's management information deficiencies, management is unable to make accurate judgements about CCC's progress and effectiveness. CCC, therefore, cannot realistically plan for the systematic implementation of policies. It also may have difficulty determining the extent to which a desired level of performance is accomplished. Finally, CCC should develop sufficient data on program performance not only to satisfy the ongoing informational needs of management but to justify extension of CCC beyond 1981.

Respectfully submitted,



JOHN H. WILLIAMS
Auditor General

Date: November 14, 1978

Staff: Harold L. Turner, Audit Manager
William M. Zimmerling, CPA, Supervising Auditor
Richard C. Tracy
Ann Arneill
Melanie M. Kee
Edwin H. Shepherd

CALIFORNIA CONSERVATION CORPS

1530 Capitol Avenue, Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 445-8183



November 9, 1978

Mr. John H. Williams, Auditor General
Joint Legislative Audit Committee
925 L Street, Suite 750
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Williams:

On October 17, 1978, we received a draft of your report entitled A Program Review of the California Conservation Corps. We appreciate the opportunity to respond to this draft and understand that our response will be distributed with the report. If there are any substantive changes to your report as a result of our comments, I would appreciate the opportunity to review and comment on them.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

LeRoy Chatfield
Director

Attachments



PREFACE

We appreciate the results of the Joint Legislative Audit Committee's efforts. We met with the auditors during the course of the audit and believe that the meetings and the report will result in program improvements for the CCC. It is predictable that a department seeking "to get things done" can benefit by an outside view to point out how things might be done better, and to focus management upon areas needing attention. The Joint Legislative Audit Committee has served this function well.

We have chosen to comment on the major aspects of the audit report to present the CCC view, where appropriate, and to state the actions the CCC is taking in response to the Joint Legislative Audit Committee's findings and recommendations.

SELECTION OF CONSERVATION WORK PROJECTS

The CCC is obliged to the Joint Legislative Audit Committee staff for recognizing that "most projects appear to be aligned with the intent of the legislation establishing the program." The CCC has developed public service conservation work project priorities. They are stated in the Director's goals for fiscal year 1978-79:

- Goal 1. 2,000,000 hours of public service conservation work for the citizens of California.
- Goal 2. Plant 3,000,000 trees in the California National Forests.
- Goal 3. Grow 120,000 Jojoba seedlings at the San Luis Obispo CCC Nursery.

Grow 150,000 native tree seedlings at the Agnews CCC Nursery.

Grow 200,000 conifer seedlings at the Napa CCC Nursery.
- Goal 4. Collect 13,000 pounds of seed cones to propagate approximately 30,000,000 trees.
- Goal 5. Plant 1,000 acres of Jojoba.
- Goal 6. Protect 1,500 acres of Big Basin State Park through fire hazard reduction.
- Goal 7. Preserve 400 more giant Sequoias at Calaveras Big Trees through fire hazard reduction.

- Goal 8. Complete six major historical preservation projects statewide.
- Goal 9. Complete six major public service projects providing recreation access for all disabled in urban areas.
- Goal 10. To prepare 24 CCC centers to respond within four hours to a fire, flood, or any other emergency.
- Goal 11. Construct 20 miles of hiking and equestrian trails from San Bernardino County line to Hart Bar State Park.
- Goal 12. Integrate corpsmembers with disabilities into all CCC centers.

To obtain these goals, the CCC has a detailed system for the evaluation of proposed projects, and the evaluation of completed projects. We recognize that the existence of a system does not insure complete compliance with the system. Some of the difficulties are caused by the numbers of project proposals submitted to the CCC. It is virtually impossible for all projects to meet all the criteria, and thus judgment enters the system. The detail into which the CCC goes to evaluate proposed and completed projects is illustrated by the attached forms: CCC 96, CCC 86, CCC 45.

The CCC is also implementing the Joint Legislative Audit Committee's recommendations by establishing a Director's In-Process Review of conservation work projects. This is an initial step to improve our system and insure understanding of and compliance with the system.

The In-Process Review will be scheduled once a month. The Director and his executive staff will review the project proposals submitted during the prior month, and the evaluations of ongoing and completed projects. The CCC also plans to solicit input from other natural resources oriented departments to determine how we might improve our view of public service conservation work priorities.

The In-Process Review is intended to accomplish the following:

- o insure compliance with the legislation,
- o focus attention on the significance of selecting appropriate projects, doing quality work, and accurately evaluating each project,
- o improve and perhaps simplify the project approval and evaluation process, and
- o insure compliance with the process.

HIRING PRACTICES

The Joint Legislative Audit Committee and the CCC agree that the hiring practices of the CCC comply with the law. In evaluating the CCC program, the Joint Legislative Audit Committee auditors raised the question of whether the legislators should instruct the CCC to narrow its focus to unemployed youth. This is a reasonable inquiry.

As a result of the auditors' concern, the CCC accumulated the data on all the corpsmembers who have entered the program. These data will assist the Joint Legislative Audit Committee and the legislators in deciding whether the CCC recruitment focus is appropriate.

From the summary data (attached), we can conclude:

Ethnicity A representative cross-section of the State is represented in the CCC.

Sex We shall continue to seek a higher percentage of women, but 29.4 percent of women entering a program such as the CCC is reasonable.

Age Until July 1978, the age criteria for entry in the CCC was 18 through 20. The acceptance of Federal funds required the CCC to change the age requirement to 16 through 23. We concur with the inclusion of 22 through 23 year olds, but disagree with the inclusion of 16 through 17 year olds. We do not believe 16 year olds should be mixed with 23 year olds in a residential program. The Department of Labor is reviewing our position.

Education We believe this is a reasonable representation of the age group.

City/Zip Code A reasonable representation.

Employed The data were taken from applications, and until November 1978, the CCC did not inquire whether a corpsmember had been previously employed. The Joint Legislative Audit Committee conducted a survey which showed 9 percent of the corpsmembers were unemployed prior to coming to the CCC. The CCC then conducted a survey which showed 46 percent were unemployed prior to coming to the CCC. The disparity was caused by the difference in the groupings. The auditors grouped students separately; the CCC considered students to be unemployed, unless they stated that they were employed.

SUMMARY DATA
CLASSES 1-14

California Conservation Corps
Total Demographic Profile on Corpsmembers

		<u>Totals</u>	<u>Percent</u>
<u>TOTAL # CORPSMEMBERS (CLASSES 1-14)</u>		2,622	100.0%
<u>ETHNICITY</u>	<u>GOALS*</u>		
Asian/Polynesian	2.0%	29	1.1%
Black	8.3	447	17.0%
Filipino	.7	3	0.1%
Hispanic	19.0	390	14.9%
Native American	.5	39	1.5%
White	69.2	1,671	63.7%
Other	.3	42	1.6%
Data Not Available	-	1	0.1%
TOTAL	100.0%	2,622	100.0%
<u>SEX</u>			
Male		1,850	70.6%
Female		772	29.4%
TOTAL		2,622	100.0%
<u>AGE</u>			
16		1	0.1%
17		11	0.4%
18		1,119	42.7%
19		905	34.5%
20		536	20.4%
21		49	1.8%
22		1	0.1%
TOTAL		2,622	100.0%
<u>EDUCATION</u>			
8th & Under		7	0.3%
9th - 11th		735	28.0%
12th or GED		1,368	52.2%
College		477	18.2%
Data Not Available		35	1.3%
TOTAL		2,622	100.0%
<u>CITY/ZIP CODE</u>			
Northern Cities (Zip Codes 96-93)		1,281	48.9%
Southern Cities (Zip Codes 92-90)		1,328	50.6%
Data Not Available		13	0.5%
TOTAL		2,622	100.0%
<u>EMPLOYED</u>			
Full-time		158	6.0%
Part-time		122	4.7%
Data Not Available		2,342	89.3%
TOTAL		2,622	100.0%
<u>DISABLED</u>		61	2.3%
<u>VETERANS</u>		33	1.3%

*Based on ethnic distribution among 16-23 years old.

APPROPRIATE TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM

The CCC goal is to have corpsmembers spend 75 percent of their work hours on public service conservation work projects. When a new center is opened, this is not possible. We do most of our own work and the first 45-60 days following the opening of a center, a significant amount of renovation and alterations are required.

The remaining 25 percent of the work hours available are to be spent on the Appropriate Technology curriculum. But, appropriate technology during work hours is devoted almost exclusively to functions essential to sustaining the center. We credit the hours to appropriate technology because of the training value to corpsmembers. The functions are: food service, facility maintenance and repair, minor improvement (i.e., painting, partitioning) and maintenance of vehicles, equipment, and tools. A small portion of the 25 percent is devoted to center projects that are judgmentally evaluated. That is, the project may not be essential to the center, but we believe it makes a substantive contribution to the program or to the center. Examples of these kinds of projects are: the installation of a small saw mill, the care of the farm and its animals, and the maintenance of a tree nursery. However, most of the work on these projects is done during nonwork hours.

Owing to the auditors' findings, the CCC analyzed the conservation work hours for May and July. The same months were analyzed by the auditors. We found, as did the auditors, room for improvement. We also found an overall improvement from May to July at the nonfire centers. It is difficult to assess the fire-designated centers during July. Most of their effort is fire related, and many hours are devoted to preparation, training, and stand-by for the fire mission.

Nonfire Centers

<u>HOURS OBTAINED FROM PAYROLL RECORDS</u>	<u>MAY 1978</u>	<u>JULY 1978</u>
<u>Agnews:</u>		
Total Hours Paid	9,214	5,776
Less: Sick leave/ Vacation/Docks	800	1,432
Net Hours Available	8,414	4,344
PSCW Reported	4,281	4,175
Percentage of Hours Spent on Public Service Conservation Work (PSCW)	50 %	96 %

<u>Camarillo:</u>	<u>MAY 1978</u>	<u>JULY 1978</u>
Total Hours Paid	7,060	7,176
Less: Sick leave/ Vacation/Docks	328	472
Net Hours Available	6,732	6,704
PSCW Reported	3,177	4,022
Percentage of Hours Spent on PSCW	47%	59%
<u>Escondido:</u>		
Total Hours Paid	6,411	5,973
Less: Sick leave/ Vacation/Docks	56	96
Net Hours Available	6,355	5,877
PSCW Reported	3,195	3,390
Percentage of Hours Spent on PSCW	50%	57%
<u>San Luis Obispo:</u>		
Total Hours Paid	5,449	7,040
Less: Sick leave/ Vacation/Docks	400	376
Net Hours Available	5,049	6,664
PSCW Reported	3,640	3,256
Percentage of Hours Spent on PSCW	72%	48%
<u>Siskiyou:</u>		
Total Hours Paid	4,806	7,313
Less: Sick leave/ Vacation/Docks	448	840
Net Hours Available	4,358	6,473
PSCW Reported	2,168	6,056
Percentage of Hours Spent on PSCW	50%	93%

<u>Yountville:</u>	<u>MAY 1978</u>	<u>JULY 1978</u>
Total Hours Paid	7,916	7,340
Less: Sick leave/ Vacation/Docks	432	312
Net Hours Available	7,484	7,028
PSCW Reported	4,368	3,742
Percentage of Hours Spent on PSCW	58%	53%
 <u>San Pedro:</u>		
Total Hours Paid	5,794	5,077
Less: Sick leave/ Vacation/Docks	152	224
Net Hours Available	5,642	4,853
PSCW Reported	4,964	4,958
Percentage of Hours Spent on PSCW	88%	102%
AVERAGE PERCENTAGE	58.6 %	72.5 %

Fire Centers

<u>Butte:</u>		
Total Hours Paid	7,916	10,792
Less: Sick leave/ Vacation/Docks	320	512
Net Hours Available	7,596	10,280
PSCW Reported	5,416	6,619
Percentage of Hours Spent on PSCW	71%	64%

<u>Calaveras:</u>		
Total Hours Paid	6,368	7,082
Less: Sick leave/ Vacation/Docks	152	768
Net Hours Available	6,216	6,314
PSCW Reported	2,696	3,764
Percentage of Hours Spent on PSCW	42%	59%

<u>Del Norte:</u>	<u>MAY 1978</u>	<u>JULY 1978</u>
Total Hours Paid	7,336	8,836
Less: Sick leave/ Vacation/Docks	608	560
Net Hours Available	6,728	8,276
PSCW Reported	4,400	3,760
Percentage of Hours Spent on PSCW	65%	45%
<u>Humboldt:</u>		
Total Hours Paid	5,668	7,872
Less: Sick leave/ Vacation/Docks	128	688
Net Hours Available	5,540	7,184
PSCW Reported	3,504	4,156
Percentage of Hours Spent on PSCW	63%	57%
<u>Inyo:</u>		
Total Hours Paid	9,122	10,962
Less: Sick leave/ Vacation/Docks	176	112
Net Hours Available	8,946	10,850
PSCW Reported	5,238	6,651
Percentage of Hours Spent on PSCW	58%	61%
<u>Placer:</u>		
Total Hours Paid	6,368	9,662
Less: Sick leave/ Vacation/Docks	344	576
Net Hours Available	6,024	9,086
PSCW Reported	4,176	7,156
Percentage of Hours Spent on PSCW	69%	78%

<u>Tehama:</u>	<u>MAY 1978</u>	<u>JULY 1978</u>
Total Hours Paid	6,037	8,856
Less: Sick leave/ Vacation/Docks	688	696
Net Hours Available	5,349	8,160
PSCW Reported	3,392	5,368
Percentage of Hours Spent on PSCW	63%	65%
AVERAGE PERCENTAGE	61.5 %	61.2 %

The CCC intends to have 75 percent of corpsmembers' work hours spent on public service conservation work.

The initial step, caused by the audit process, has been taken. The step consisted of a detailed review of how each center plans and executes its work schedule. This has served to place increased emphasis upon the goal, and upon the necessity to accurately define and record hours.

Effective December 1, 1978 a primary and a secondary measurement system will be adopted that will offer to management an overview of how time is being used. The system is relatively simple to execute, and sufficiently complete to insure accuracy.

The primary measure will be to compute each month by center and review quarterly:

- o hours available to the center,
- o hours on public service conservation work,
- o on-site hours and how the hours were used
(e.g., fire training, maintenance),
- o percentages, and
- o hours reported compared to payroll hours.

The secondary system will serve as a continual update and a check on the primary system. The information will be obtained daily, and reviewed monthly and quarterly. The system will depend upon the following data:

- o Corpsmember Information
 - strength
 - number of corpsmembers on site
 - number of corpsmembers on PSCW
 - other (vacation, medical)

- o Hours
 - available
 - planned per project
 - actual on project
 - percentages
- o Payroll
 - hours reported
 - overtime and CTO hours

The combination of these systems will give the Director sufficient data to focus on areas requiring attention. The system will be supported by the primary management method of the CCC--personal visits by the Director and/or his staff.

ATTRITION

The audit process has served to increase the need for an evaluation of attrition, and the CCC will continue to analyze the nature and causes of attrition and determine what, if anything, can be done about it.

There are two aspects to the auditors' findings relative to attrition. The first concerns the rate of attrition, and the second, whether the CCC can accomplish its goals in view of attrition. We shall comment on both aspects.

The Rate of Attrition

The CCC readily acknowledges that attrition for the first five classes was 61 percent after a complete year. Further, we do not believe that this rate will be immediately reduced.

The causes of attrition in the CCC are directly related to the kind of program the CCC has developed and the age group the program serves. It is a program that demands a day of hard physical work for a day's pay, and further demands adherence to high disciplinary standards.

The program serves young adults at a transition period in most of their lives. They are trying to decide where they want to go and where they can go; adolescence has passed, but maturity has not arrived. They come from every conceivable background. Most have never been challenged; many have never worked, and conformity to a set of rules is a brand new requirement. Thus, we expect attrition. But, whether a young adult spends two weeks, two months, or two years with the CCC, all will have learned from having been part of a program that placed a demand upon them and caused them to realize that "there are no free lunches."

We believe that this is the kind of program California needs for its youth, and the kind the legislators envisioned. We also recognize that our standards fly in the face of values developed during the past decade. The talk throughout the United States for our youth now includes phrases such as, "back to the basics," "pursuit of excellence," "there is nothing wrong with a hard day's work." It seems that we have reversed the concept that "you owe it to me" to the more realistic "you must earn it." The CCC believes the latter.

We, thus, think that attrition should not automatically be regarded as "bad." It deserves some understanding. There is, first, attrition by voluntary resignation. Corpsmembers leave for a variety of reasons; personal (homesickness, dislike of hard work, inability to remain part of a disciplined group, this is negative attrition), medical and family reasons (neutral attrition), or to return to school or take a better job (positive attrition). Second, there is attrition by termination which is involuntary and done mostly for breaches of discipline (we have in the past classified this as negative, but we view it separately, and in the future it shall be classified as disciplinary attrition). We intend to increase our focus upon these aspects of attrition, and to act if and when we identify better ways to do things.

The CCC's Second Chance program offers interesting insights into attrition. The program was begun in April; it allows corpsmembers who voluntarily leave, or who are terminated, to petition the Director for reinstatement. Approximately 250 (30 percent of the possible total) have requested reinstatement. From those who resigned, we hear: "I should never have left; it was the best thing that ever happened to me." From those who were fired for disciplinary reasons, we hear: "I know I messed up," "Can I have another chance?" "I won't do it again," "The CCC was the best thing that ever happened to me." The corpsmembers who return under the Second Chance program are statistically new hires. We do not adjust the attrition rate established as a result of their leaving. Thus, if 20 corpsmembers leave before completion of a year, the attrition percentage is based upon 20; if 5 of the 20 corpsmembers return under Second Chance, the previous attrition rate is still based upon 20 losses.

The Training Academy serves as a screening process; the attrition is about 30 percent. We are analyzing the Training Academy's attrition separately, but it shall remain a screening process, and thus, will continue to have attrition.

In summary, we are addressing attrition. We believe a certain amount is healthy, but recognize that there is a limit. Specifically, we shall address attrition in the following manner:

- o work and discipline standards shall not be reduced to reduce attrition,
- o the Academy will continue as a screening process, as well as, a training center,
- o continue to conduct training for the EDD field staff so as to improve the selection process,
- o examine length of stay vs. percentage of attrition to see if a year is optimum length for the age group in this kind of program.

Can the CCC Accomplish its Goals in Light of Attrition?

We can, indeed, accomplish the Director's goals (see pages 1 and 2). The Training Academy's scheduled input has been adjusted, and we shall have 1,440+ corpsmembers in the field in May 1979. This equates to 24 base centers with 60 corpsmembers per center. The corpsmember population shall be 1,600, 1,440 in the field plus the Training Academy pipeline.

The attached chart displays the work accomplished during the first quarter of FY 1978-79. The total hours--432,632--are about 22 percent of the 2,000,000 forecasted. Based upon the projected increase of some 500 corpsmembers in the field, 2,000,000 is a realistic goal.

Attachments

PUBLIC SERVICE CONSERVATION WORK
JULY THROUGH SEPTEMBER 1978

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Number of Completed Projects</u>	<u>Number of Projects in Progress</u>	<u>Number of Staff and Corpsmember Hours</u>	<u>% of Total</u>
Emergencies	91	3	108,323	25
Reforestation and Forest Improvement	10	16	60,202	14
Fish and Wildlife Conservation	7	11	17,002	4
Park and Recreation Development	18	32	74,288	17
Fire Hazard Reduction	3	16	98,530	23
Water and Soil Conservation	4	11	9,545	2
Conservation Rehab & Construction	8	25	42,770	10
Visitor Service	5	3	2,784	.6
Training for Emergencies	<u>0</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>19,188</u>	<u>4.4</u>
	146	126	432,632	100.0

CALIFORNIA CONSERVATION CORPS

1530 CAPITOL AVENUE, SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

(916) 322-6790

**AGREEMENT**

This agreement is made and entered into by and between the California Conservation Corps, State of California, hereinafter referred to as "CCC", and

hereinafter called "Sponsor".

WHEREAS, the CCC wishes to provide training in job skills and environmental education to young men and women of California through a program which includes projects in public service conservation work, and

WHEREAS, the Sponsor can provide opportunities for public service through meaningful and productive work projects,

NOW THEREFORE, in consideration of the above, the parties hereto agree as follows:

- A. The Sponsor shall submit project proposals on a form approved by the Director, CCC. By so doing, with reference to any such proposals subsequently approved by the Director, CCC, Sponsor agrees to:
 1. Pay for all costs directly related to and necessitated by such projects, except as follows:
 - a. Wages, salaries and other remuneration paid to CCC employees, and the cost of their support.
 - b. The cost of transportation of CCC employees to and from such project sites, unless travel time exceeds two hours per day or requires special vehicles.
 2. Demonstrate the availability of adequate plans and specifications, sufficient funds, materials, supplies, and equipment, adequate technical supervision and any special labor requirements to complete such project.
 3. Obtain the approvals and permits required by any other state, federal, or local agency necessary to commence construction or operation of such projects.
 4. Obtain any clearances and meet any other requirements of trade unions or other labor organizations occasioned by the participation of the CCC in such projects.
 5. Provide acceptable temporary living facilities for the duration of any such projects located more than one hour's driving time from a CCC base center for CCC personnel actually engaged in working on such projects, as well as all transportation required from the nearest CCC base center.
 6. Hold an orientation meeting with CCC personnel at the commencement of such projects to explain the technical aspects, execution of and need for such projects.
 7. Present or arrange for the presentation of evening educational programs at the CCC base center nearest such project sites. These presentations may have emphasis on the history of project sites or areas, technical aspects of projects, public benefit to be derived from these or similar projects, the relationship of such projects to resources or wildlife management, or similar subjects.
- B. The CCC shall select, from proposals submitted by the Sponsor, those projects meeting the priorities and resources of the CCC, and shall submit to Sponsor evaluations setting forth any special requirements or conditions occasioned thereby. By so doing, with reference to any such evaluations subsequently approved by Sponsor, the CCC agrees to provide all labor, crew supervision, transportation (if within one hour's driving time by two-wheel drive vehicle from the nearest CCC base center), food and such tools as the CCC Project Coordinator determines to be available. Upon receipt of Sponsor's acceptance of such evaluations, projects shall be assigned to a CCC base center, where they will be scheduled in accordance with the priorities and resources of the CCC.
- C. The Sponsor recognizes that the CCC exists under a legislative mandate to act under the direction and control of the State Office of Emergency Services, Department of Forestry and other agencies to assist the people of the State of California in times of emergencies arising from fire, flood and wind and other natural and man-caused disasters and emergencies.

The Sponsor further recognizes that the resources of the CCC are limited, and the public service conservation work of the CCC may be altered in priority from time to time.

Projects will be performed within the rules and regulations of the CCC, which may require temporary suspension or permanent cessation of projects due to emergency conditions as defined by such rules and regulations.

The parties agree that delays by either party shall be excused and costs caused by such delays shall be borne by the party incurring such costs.

- D. Work performed under this agreement will be under the immediate supervision of the CCC officials. The Sponsor will provide such operation supervision, technical assistance, guidance and inspection as it considers necessary to properly complete the work.
- E. Nothing herein shall be construed as obligating the Sponsor to expend or obligate funds in excess of appropriations authorized by law.
- F. All improvements constructed in whole or in part on lands owned or controlled by Sponsor will remain the property of the Sponsor.
- G. Permission to camp and perform work on lands owned or controlled by Sponsor does not in any way convey to the CCC, its staff, or any person or persons working with the CCC in the performance of said work, employee status that would extend to them the benefits afforded to permanent employees of Sponsor.
- H. Upon completion of each project, or any phase thereof, permission is hereby granted to the CCC to place upon the project site a sign or emblem, consistent in size and design to its surroundings, indicating the participation of the CCC and the year thereof.
- I. The CCC and Sponsor each agree to indemnify and hold harmless the other, its officers, agents and employees from all claims, demands or liability caused by the indemnifying party during or after completion of the project.
- J. Neither party may assign this contract or any interest therein without the written consent of the other party.
- K. All contracts relating to the construction or operation of the project, including those executed following completion of the project, shall contain a clause prohibiting discrimination against any employee or employee applicant engaged in project work or project operation, on the basis of race, religion, sex, color, ancestry, age, physical handicap or national origin. Such clause shall include all aspects of employer-employee and employer-employee applicant relations.
- L. Subject to the provisions herein, all remedies allowed by law are available to either party for enforcement of this contract. Any waiver of rights by either party on any matter relating to this contract shall not be deemed to be a waiver on any other matter relating to this contract.
- M. If any part of this contract is found to be invalid the remainder of the contract shall continue in effect.
- N. This contract may be modified by mutual written agreement of the parties.
- O. This agreement shall remain in effect unless terminated upon sixty (60) days written notice from either party to the other.
- P. No member of, or delegate to, Congress, or Resident Commissioner, shall be admitted to any share or part of this agreement, or to any benefit that may arise therefrom; but this provision shall not be construed to extend this agreement if made with a corporation for its general benefit. (Applicable only if Sponsor is an agency of the United States Government).

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have agreed to the conditions of this Agreement as of the last date written below.

Date: _____

Date: _____

Sponsor: _____
(Name of Agency)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
California Conservation Corps

By: _____

By: _____

Title: _____

Title: _____

Address: _____

California Conservation Corps
Public Service Conservation Work

FIELD EVALUATION OF PROPOSED PROJECT

Project # (if already assigned): _____

CCC Center: _____

Evaluator: _____

Date Visited: _____ 19 _____

Sponsor: _____

Today's Date: _____

Sponsor's Rep.
Present: (name) _____

1. BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT (If sponsor's description is insufficient)

2. ESTIMATED CREW SIZE AND WORK DAYS/WEEKS/MONTHS REQUIRED TO COMPLETE PROJECT
(if different from sponsor's estimate)

3. RECOMMENDED STARTING AND COMPLETION DATE (if important)

4. ESTIMATED DAILY TRAVEL TIME, ONE WAY

5. BRIEFLY EXPLAIN HOW THE PROJECT MEETS THE OBJECTIVES OF:

a. Conserving, improving, developing natural resources, maintaining environmentally important lands, or providing recreational benefits.

Low 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 High

b. Providing corpsmembers with opportunities for training in employable skills
(i.e. specific tools and use, fire control, resource management, carpentry, etc.)

Low 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 High

c. Increasing environmental awareness of corpsmembers through education.

Low 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 High

6. (a) HAS THE SPONSOR AGREED TO PRESENT A PROGRAM AT THE CENTER OR SPIKE CAMP AS FULFILLMENT OF THEIR PART IN EDUCATING CORPSMEMBERS? (the environmental/cultural/historical aspects of)
- (b) IF SO, WHAT WILL THE PROGRAM BE? WHEN WILL IT BE GIVEN?
- (c) IF NOT, WHAT OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL OR CULTURAL/HISTORICAL EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITY HAS BEEN ARRANGED (such as on-site instruction).
7. (a) IF A SPIKE PROJECT, ARE THE HOUSING/EATING FACILITIES ADEQUATE?
- (b) IF NOT, WHAT IS DEFICIENT?
- (c) HAS THE SPONSOR AGREED TO REPAIR THE DEFICIENCIES BEFORE THE CORPSMEMBERS ARRIVE?
8. WILL THE FOLLOWING BE ON HAND WHEN REQUIRED:
- Tools:
- Equipment:
- Materials:
9. POTENTIAL PROBLEMS YOU FORSEE:

PUBLIC SERVICE CONSERVATION WORK PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

NOTE: This form is to be filled out by the Conservationist I or Crew Supervisor and the crew who worked on the project.

[illegible]

(OVER)

-49-

4. HOW WELL DID SPONSOR FULFILL THEIR COMMITMENTS AS TO:		
a. Orientation and training <div style="border-bottom: 1px dotted black; height: 1.2em; margin-top: 5px;"></div>		
b. Tools and equipment <div style="border-bottom: 1px dotted black; height: 1.2em; margin-top: 5px;"></div>		
c. Materials <div style="border-bottom: 1px dotted black; height: 1.2em; margin-top: 5px;"></div>		
d. Planning <div style="border-bottom: 1px dotted black; height: 1.2em; margin-top: 5px;"></div>		
5. CCC PURCHASE ESTIMATES, IF ANY: <div style="border-bottom: 1px dotted black; height: 1.2em; margin-top: 5px;"></div>		
6. PARTICULAR PROBLEMS/COMMENTS/SUGGESTIONS: <div style="border-bottom: 1px dotted black; height: 1.2em; margin-top: 5px;"></div> <div style="border-bottom: 1px dotted black; height: 1.2em; margin-top: 5px;"></div> <div style="border-bottom: 1px dotted black; height: 1.2em; margin-top: 5px;"></div> <div style="border-bottom: 1px dotted black; height: 1.2em; margin-top: 5px;"></div>		
7. HOW COULD THE PROJECT EVALUATION (OR OTHER INPUT) FROM SACRAMENTO HAVE BEEN IMPROVED: <div style="border-bottom: 1px dotted black; height: 1.2em; margin-top: 5px;"></div> <div style="border-bottom: 1px dotted black; height: 1.2em; margin-top: 5px;"></div> <div style="border-bottom: 1px dotted black; height: 1.2em; margin-top: 5px;"></div> <div style="border-bottom: 1px dotted black; height: 1.2em; margin-top: 5px;"></div> <div style="border-bottom: 1px dotted black; height: 1.2em; margin-top: 5px;"></div>		
8. FUTURE PROJECT POSSIBILITIES RELATED TO OR SUGGESTED BY THIS EXPERIENCE. <div style="border-bottom: 1px dotted black; height: 1.2em; margin-top: 5px;"></div> <div style="border-bottom: 1px dotted black; height: 1.2em; margin-top: 5px;"></div> <div style="border-bottom: 1px dotted black; height: 1.2em; margin-top: 5px;"></div> <div style="border-bottom: 1px dotted black; height: 1.2em; margin-top: 5px;"></div> <div style="border-bottom: 1px dotted black; height: 1.2em; margin-top: 5px;"></div>		
SIGNATURE	<input type="checkbox"/> CONSERVATIONIST I <input type="checkbox"/> CREW SUPERVISOR	DATE <div style="text-align: right; font-size: 1.2em;">19</div>
SIGNATURE OF CENTER DIRECTOR OR CENTER RANGER APPROVED:		DATE <div style="text-align: right; font-size: 1.2em;">19</div>

CALIFORNIA CONSERVATION CORPS CENTERS
SEPTEMBER 1978

- | | |
|--|---|
| (1) Del Norte CCC Center
Star Route
Orick, California 95555
(707) 482-2761 | (10) Camarillo CCC Center
P. O. Box A-CCC
Camarillo, California 93010
(805) 484-4345 |
| (2) Humboldt CCC Center
Post Office Box 176
Weott, California 95571
(707) 946-2362 | (11) Agnews CCC Center
P. O. Box 4128
Santa Clara, California 95054
(408) 277-1150 |
| (3) Tehama CCC Center
General Delivery
Paynes Creek, California 96075
(916) 597-2352 | (12) San Jacinto CCC Center
P. O. Box 169
Mountain Center, California 92361
(714) 659-2861 |
| (4) Butte CCC Center
P. O. Box 218
Magalia, California 95954
(916) 873-0330 | (13) Yountville CCC Center
P. O. Box 329
Yountville, California 94599
(707) 944-2422 |
| (5) Placer CCC Center
3710 Christian Valley Road
Auburn, California 95603
(916) 878-7220 | (14) Siskiyou CCC Center
P. O. Box 645
Montague, California 96064
(916) 459-3462 |
| (6) Calaveras CCC Center
Star Route 1, Box 7
Angels Camp, California 95222
(209) 736-2553 | (15) San Pedro CCC Center
P. O. Box 5348
San Pedro, California 90733
(213) 831-0185 |
| (7) Inyo CCC Center
Route 2, Box 22-L
Bishop, California 93514
(714) 387-2401 | (16) Santa Cruz*
20161 Big Basin Highway 236
Boulder Creek, California 95006 |
| (8) San Luis Obispo CCC Center
Route 2, Box 426C
San Luis Obispo, California 93401
(805) 543-0437 | (17) Radford*
P. O. Box 128
Angeles Oaks, California 92305 |
| (9) Escondido CCC Center
Route 6 - 640
Escondido, California 92025
(714) 741-2981 | (18) Training Academy at Bret Harte
P. O. Box 389
Murphys, California 95247
(209) 728-3462 |

* No corpsmembers permanently assigned to these centers. Santa Cruz is termed a "permanent spike operation" and Radford is used only nine months a year due to winter weather conditions and lease arrangements.


PUBLIC SERVICE CONSERVATION WORK PROJECTS

CALIFORNIA CONSERVATION CORPS
Public Service Conservation Work
November 1976 — June 1978

Subject	Number of Completed Projects	Number of Projects in Progress	Number of Corpsmember Hours
Emergencies	55	0	55,186
Fish and Wildlife Habitat Enhancement	34	16	68,796
Park and Recreation Development	78	21	116,657
Forest Improvement and Revegetation	36	7	127,061
Flood Control and River Clean-Up	21	1	47,724
Fire Hazard Reduction	24	2	99,562
Conservation Rehabilitation and Construction	44	10	49,064
Miscellaneous	12	1	20,898
Total	304	58	584,948

SOURCE: California Conservation Corps Information Bulletin, August 1978.

FLOW CHART OF CCC's
CONSERVATION PROJECT REVIEW PROCEDURES



SOURCE: California Conservation Corps, Administrative Procedures
April 13, 1977.

APPROPRIATE TECHNOLOGY CURRICULUM**SUBJECT AREAS IN APPROPRIATE TECHNOLOGY**

General Objectives: To develop capacities related to appropriate technology through basic skills training using a "hands on" approach. This training shall be consistent with sound environmental principles. All certifications are based on review by instructor, manager, and field deputy representative.

	Required Course Hours
1. First Aid	20 hours
2. Fire Fighting	32 hours
3. Flood Control	10 hours
4. Food Preparation	80 hours
5. Plant-food Preparation	40 hours
6. Greenhouse Horticulture	40 hours
7. Animal Husbandry	40 hours
8. Auto Mechanics	40 hours
9. Welding and Basic Steel Fabrication	20 hours
10. Basic Woodworking	40 hours
11. Sewing	10 hours
12. Creating An Art Object	10 hours
13. History of Area — Geographical/Geological .	10 hours
14. Career Planning and Employment Preparation	30 hours
15. Composting	10 hours
16. Small Tool Usage	10 hours

442 HOURS

SOURCE: A Handbook on Corpsmembers' Recruitment and Selection,
California Conservation Corps, April 1978.

CALIFORNIA CONSERVATION CORPS

1530 CAPITOL AVENUE, SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
(916) 445-8183



GOALS OF THE
CALIFORNIA CONSERVATION CORPS
1978-79

September 1978

MESSAGE FROM THE DIRECTOR

Dear Citizens of California:

As of July 1, 1978, the California Conservation Corps has accomplished 584,948 hours of public service conservation work. This is only the beginning of what we can accomplish.

I take this opportunity to lay out the CCC goals for 1978-79.

Goal 1. 2,000,000 hours of public service conservation work for the citizens of California.

Goal 2. Plant 3,000,000 trees in the California National Forests.

Goal 3. Grow 120,000 Jojoba seedlings at the San Luis Obispo CCC Nursery.

Grow 150,000 native tree seedlings at the Agnews CCC Nursery.

Grow 200,000 conifer seedlings at the Napa CCC Nursery.

Goal 4. Collect 6,000 pounds of seed cones to propagate approximately 15,000,000 trees.

Goal 5. Plant 1,000 acres of Jojoba.

Goal 6. Protect 1,500 acres of Big Basin State Park through fire hazard reduction.

Goal 7. Preserve 400 more giant Sequoias at Calaveras Big Trees through fire hazard reduction.

Goal 8. Complete six major historical preservation projects statewide.

Goal 9. Complete six major public service projects providing recreation access for the disabled in urban areas.

Goal 10. To prepare 26 CCC centers to respond within four hours to a fire, flood or any other emergency.

Goal 11. Construct 20 miles of hiking and equestrian trails from San Bernardino County line to Hart Bar State Park.

Goal 12. Integrate corpsmembers with disabilities into all CCC centers.

We intend to meet these public service goals for the citizens of California and we will continue to respond to the spirit of conservation set forth by the Legislature, the Governor and the Secretary for Resources.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "LeRoy Chatfield".

LeRoy Chatfield
Director

SOURCE: California Conservation Corps Information Office.

Office of the Auditor General

cc: Members of the Legislature
Office of the Governor
Office of the Lieutenant Governor
Secretary of State
State Controller
State Treasurer
Legislative Analyst
Director of Finance
Assembly Office of Research
Senate Office of Research
Assembly Majority/Minority Consultants
Senate Democratic/Republican Caucus
California State Department Heads
Capitol Press Corps